

Appl. No. : **09/847,598**
Filed : **May 2, 2001**

REMARKS

By this paper, Claim 49 is amended. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-11, 13-16, 19-22, 25-27, 32, 40, 43, 52 and 53 were previously canceled. Claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 17-18, 23-24, 28-31, 33-39, 41-42, 44-48, 50-51, and 54-61 are unchanged.

After entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 5-6, 9, 12, 17-18, 23-24, 28-31, 33-39, 41-42, 44-51, and 54-61 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Discussion of the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 17 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bierma et al. (WO 91/11134) in view of Kinto (U.S. Patent No. 6,142,252) and Bartsch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,955). As discussed in the Summary of Interview section above, agreement was reached that the rejection of Claim 17 over the cited references has been overcome. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the respective dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. Therefore, the rejection of the dependent Claim 61 has also been overcome.

Claims 49-51, 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bierma in view of Nakanishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,423). Claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bierma and Nakanishi et al. as applied to Claim 49 above, and further in view of Silvenis (U.S. Patent No. 5,092,699). As discussed in the Summary of Interview section above, agreement was reached that the rejection of amended Claim 49 over the cited references has been overcome. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the respective dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. Therefore, the rejection of the dependent Claims 50-51, 54-56 has also been overcome.

Allowable Claims

Claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 18, 23, 24, 28-31, 33-39, 41, 42, 44-48, and 57-59 were allowed in the Office Action dated September 17, 2003. Claim 60 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, since agreement was reached

Appl. No. : 09/847,598
Filed : May 2, 2001

regarding independent Claim 17 on which Claim 60 depends, Applicant deems Claim 60 allowable without being rewritten.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the Office Action dated September 17, 2003. In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are specifically requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds any impediment to allowing all claims that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: December 3, 2003

By: Raimond J. Salenieks
Raimond J. Salenieks
Registration No. 37,924
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\RJS\RJS-6927.DOC 103003